

“Non-Human Intelligence” (NHI): A Ruling Concept

Jake Muller



“All Messed Up” (original painting by the author)

© Jake Muller, 2026.

The copyright is a reminder not to use this publication for commercial gain without written permission (Email: jmullerhome@gmail.com). It is free to read and share.

Abbotsford, BC, Canada: Beachview Creations

Library and Archives Canada
ISBN 978-0-9686635-9-2

ISBN 978-0-99-702549-1



Foreword

This writing started out as a small article of a few pages but grew a bit so I've simply called it a booklet. I have released it earlier than anticipated since the ISBN came through quickly.

Some of the ways that I write needs to be clarified before reading. I deliberately capitalize Earth as the name that we give to our planet and not someone else's word, e.g., Gaia, Terra. I do the same for the Moon and the Sun. My use of people on Earth refers to those of us who mostly live on its surface.

I've kept the use of quotation marks to a minimum especially when I'm referring to words or phrases used by others. I tend to state who the author is of the words I've used and so tried to avoid numerous quotation marks. Please note that words in quotation marks are not my words.

I have not resolved how to avoid referring to extraterrestrials (ETs) except to use star nations, star people or beings. Whenever I have come to learn the actual names of some societies from secret space program military veterans I give them credit and state them as the source for the name, such as, Penny Bradley is the source for the Zha.a.mi society.

I've tried to give credit to everyone whose ideas that I've used. Any omissions are my errors.

Table of Contents

Foreword	2
Introduction: Some “UFO/UAP, Disclosure” Leaders that Use “NHI”	4
Chapter 1. A Research Website: Some Problems with the “Non-Human Intelligence” (NHI) Concept	7
1.1 A Research Website With No Definition of “Non-Human Intelligence” (NHI)	7
1.2 The Prejudgement in the NHI Concept	9
1.3 The Hollow “Intelligence” in NHI	10
1.4 The Oversimplification of NHIs’ “Sharing” Earth and Being Interdimensional	11
Chapter 2. A Possible Method for Understanding NHI as a Ruling Concept	13
2.1 An Institutional Meaning of Electronically Mediated NHI: Creating A Hierarchy of Ideas	13
2.2 Use Poorly Developed Stereotypes within NHI	14
2.3 Provide a Direction on How to Use the “Non-Human” Stereotype	16
2.4 Emphasize “Non-Human” to Create a Division between “Humans” and “Non-Humans”	17
2.5 Perform a “Bait-and-Switch”: Change “Intelligent Non-Human” to “Non-Human Intelligence”	18
Chapter 3. The Conceptual Extension of Ruling from NHI to “Artificial Intelligence” (AI)	21
3.1 The Conceptual Ruling Hierarchy of NHI and AIs	21
3.2 “AI” Ignores the Work of People and the Forms within which “AIs” Exist	22
3.3 Emphasize “AI” over the Social Interactions with “AIs”	23
3.4 “Hypothetical Intelligences” that Exist	25
Chapter 4. The Use of NHI to Create a Ruling Taxonomy	29
4.1 NHI as an Empty Concept	29
4.2 A Humanoid Sub-Heading within “Non-Human Intelligence”	30
4.3 Non-Humanoids within Non-Human Intelligence	31
4.4 An Abstracted Ruling Taxonomy within NHI	31
Conclusion	36
References	37

Introduction: Some “UFO/UAP, Disclosure” Leaders that Use “NHI”

A number of prominent people¹ involved in researching and investigating “unidentified flying objects” (UFO), “unidentified anomalous phenomena” or “unidentified aerial phenomenon” (UAP) have added a new concept to their understanding of this phenomenon called “non-human intelligence” (NHI). That NHI is a new phrase, is a point that is also made by Miles Johnston². One person who uses NHI is Danny Sheehan. He is a “renowned attorney and constitutional scholar” known for “defending whistleblowers in the UAP sphere”. He uses NHI in his interview with Chris Ramsay in relation to disclosure³. A recent video by the well known Miles Johnston of the Bases Project introduces us to the work of Peter Paget, a British intelligence officer, in UFOlogy who maintains that he has “continuous access to NHI entities”. Paget’s meaning of nonhuman intelligence includes “entities, beings of higher intelligence and interdimensional origin”. His role is as “an analyst of unusual phenomena” and as “a communicator between human institutions and nonhuman entities offering guidance to both parties in the pursuit of planetary harmony and survival”⁴. He uses NHI and non-human entities interchangeably.

Other well known people include George Knapp and Jeremy Corbell who were interviewed by Jules Urbach. Urbach interviewed Knapp and Corbell where he stated that we are “dealing with non-human intelligence” because we’re “experiencing what it’s like to have somebody on the other side ... talking to us”⁵. Further on in the interview, Knapp refers to an alien intelligence that he considers to be an “AI intelligence that moves from planet to planet in a variety of really interesting ways”⁶. His NHI reference is to AI. Corbell highlights the sentience of some spacecraft, indicating that they exhibit intelligence.

Another proponent of the use of NHI is Ross Coulthart. Coulthart is part of a team that has a website entitled Advena Research (changed from NHIR which stands for non-human intelligence research). This website presents him as a “multi-award-winning investigative journalist and best-selling author” who has “broadcast multiple UAP-related documentaries for Ch7 News Australia”⁷. As a research website, it provides funding opportunities for projects that are “dedicated to advancing science and policies surrounding Unidentified Anomalous Phenomena that is potentially linked to non-human intelligence”⁸. He and his team are clearly interested in how it relates to UAP.

One of the best known people in the “disclosure movement” about aerial and other phenomena is Dr. Steven Greer. What caught my attention about the problem of using the concept or idea of

¹ This writing is for a general audience. For people unfamiliar with critical analysis, I want to make it clear that I focus on the use of the ideas by certain people. There is no attempt on my part to be malicious, demeaning or personally derogatory to anyone that I’m writing about. I am only analyzing the ideas that they use.

² Johnston, 2025 May 3, timestamp 9:03 to around 9:12.

³ Sheehan, 2025 Mar 14, timestamps 29:55, 30:00; 1:37:06; 1:37:18; 1:38:08; 2:25:14. Additional references, 2:26:04; 2:30:54; 2:31:47; 2:34:37; 3:01:07; 3:04:37 and 3:04:44.

⁴ Johnston, 2025 May 3, timestamp 10:29 to around 10:46.

⁵ Knapp & Corbell, 2025 Apr 29, timestamp 1:22 to around 1:30.

⁶ Knapp & Corbell, 2025 Apr 29, timestamp 5:44 to around 5:48; 22:29 to about 22:35.

⁷ Coulthart, Ross on Advena Research website: <https://www.advenaresearch.com/about/people/ross-coulthart>

⁸ “Advena Research Projects” on Advena Research website: <https://www.advenaresearch.com/projects>

NHI was an interview that he did with Danny Jones⁹. Greer refers to the fake names of UFOs/UAPs when Jones interjects stating that he hates “how everyone’s calling it NHI all of sudden”. Greer responds briefly stating, “We’ll get into this. It’s the CIA, uh, psychological warfare division that has the Linguistics Department”¹⁰. Regrettably, they never discuss this change of concepts from UFO/UAP to NHI in this interview. It is clear that Greer has considerable background knowledge about the creation of NHI as some kind of psychological warfare tool that the rest of us do not know. Even though he hints at NHI being an intelligence tool he still uses it, presumably since many others in the network do as well.

These are some of the well known people in the UFO/UAP and “disclosure” hierarchical, social network who have added NHI to their public statements¹¹. This doesn’t necessarily mean that they endorse its use, as in the case of Johnston and Greer. They may also be attempting to try to understand it since it’s relatively new to many of us. I find the concept NHI troubling and so I decided to analyse it.

My analysis is not a research project, psychological understanding, philosophical inquiry nor a linguistic analysis. It is a social investigation into how some authors use the NHI concept. My investigation is based what I’ve called institutional galactic ethnography or simply galactic ethnography¹². I present one part of it to show how an inquiry into an author’s use of a concept or idea might be accomplished. It is not a general approach to be used in all contexts. It is a particular illustration from which others might borrow or adapt. I refer to this investigation here as a descriptive social relation analysis of a concept or idea. By social relation I mean the people involved, their organized relation to a concept and how they use it in a historical context. It includes the person reading about the concept. It’s a social analysis based on an author’s own terms and context.

My specific focus for this booklet is on analysing NHI. I will describe how an author uses NHI in their respective context. A key part of this analysis includes the social class and gender relations of the NHI concept. My inquiry will reveal that the authors who employ the NHI concept to their area of inquiry are engaging in a subjugating or ruling process.

To get an understanding of NHI and how it is part of the way that we are being ruled by those who use it, I’ve organized this inquiry into four general parts. The first chapter will be a description of one meaning of NHI that is used on the Advena Research website mentioned earlier. I am only interested in the meaning of NHI that they adopt from a governmental institution and will provide a descriptive analysis of it as a ruling device. I am not undertaking an

⁹ Greer, 2025.

¹⁰ Greer, 2025. The time stamp for this conversation is from around 7:11 to 7:16 minutes.

¹¹ Incidentally, I investigated the public information available on the net worth of some of these prominent men for 2024 - 2025 from various websites (see References). The sources below state that this information may not be reliable but here it is:

Corbell, \$2.17M (from Corbell, Jeremy K.L. 2025 Jul. “Net Worth” on People Ai website)

Coulthart, \$3.11M (from Coulthart, Ross. 2025 Jul. “Net Worth” on People Ai website)

Greer, \$34.7M (from Greer, Steven M. 2025 Jul. Net Worth on People Ai website)

Knapp, \$5M (from Mehrotra, Kriti. 2024 Nov 9.)

Sheehan, \$20.5M (from Sheehan on Benzinga website)

¹² Muller, 2024, pp. 20-24.

analysis of their understanding of UAPs. Some of my understanding of NHI from the first chapter is used to present the second chapter. In this chapter I will show how it's possible to create NHI into a ruling concept. The social dynamics involved in its conceptual development helps to understand how it is used by other authors in different contexts. Each author's context is different and requires an analysis specific to it.

One of these contexts, offered in the third chapter, examines NHI in relation to "artificial intelligence" (AI) within a business or economic context. I argue that AI, following the conceptual thinking of using NHI, hides numerous social interactions in order to subjugate them. Essentially, AI is a localized organizational version of the more abstract NHI. The other context described in relation to NHI, in the fourth and last chapter, comes from an educational institution. NHI is used to create a theoretical taxonomy pertaining to various lifeforms and objects. I argue that this taxonomy isn't very helpful in furthering our social understanding of NHI. Indeed, the taxonomy can be used to make the case that NHI isn't even necessary.

These separate ethnographic analyses are used to highlight how NHI operates as an idea of ruling other lifeforms and objects by authors or investigators who use it. Ruling is used here in a descriptive sense to refer to someone who is using, administering or managing NHI in a certain context or sector. In other words, my point is to describe how an author or researcher presents NHI or administers it to what is being investigated. This is an ethnographic account or process of ruling and not an application of ruling as a concept.

Chapter 1. A Research Website: Some Problems with the “Non-Human Intelligence” (NHI) Concept

Within the “UFO/UAP” hierarchical social network there is a serious problem about what “non-human intelligence” means. No one has come forward to offer a definition of NHI. One group that has attempted this are the authors and creators of the Advena Research website¹³.

In this chapter I present some significant problems with the Advena Research team’s website concerning their use of NHI. The main part of their website that I focus on is called “What is non-human intelligence?”¹⁴ From the start, this is a “what is it?” question that seeks an answer about an object or a thing. “Non-human Intelligence” is clearly not something that you can get a hold of or grab. A better starting point is needed to clarify what NHI refers to.

1.1 A Research Website With No Definition of “Non-Human Intelligence” (NHI)

When we get to that part of the website where it purports to present a definition of NHI, we are offered the following:

“The term ‘NHI’ is an acronym for Non-Human Intelligence. In the UAP amendments put to the United States Congress in late 2023 the term NHI was defined as:

‘Any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform regardless of nature or ultimate origin that may be presumed responsible for unidentified anomalous phenomena or of which the Federal Government has become aware.’¹⁵

“NHI is perceived as a broader term than extra-terrestrial (ET) because it encompasses the possibility that a hypothetical non-human intelligence might not be extra-terrestrial, a term that means intelligent life from beyond or outside our planet. NHI contemplates the possibility that some kind of life-form is sharing this planet with humans, or that it might be inter-dimensional.”

This website begins by repeating the meaning of NHI from the US congress. They quote and state that the US Congress is providing a definition of NHI. Essentially, they align themselves with the US government. They simply adopt and promote the same meaning of NHI as the US Congress.

Here is the first part of the sentence as presented above about the definition of NHI: “Any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform regardless of nature or ultimate origin”. This part of the

¹³ Advena Research website: <https://www.advenaresearch.com/home>

¹⁴ “What is non-human intelligence?” Advena Research website: <https://www.advenaresearch.com/home> See also Coulthart, 2024 Apr 30.

¹⁵ Here is the US Congress source and definition used by Advena Research and Coulthart: Government Publishing Office. 2024 Jul 11. S.Amdt.2610 to [S.4638](#). 118th Congress (2023-2024). US Congress website: <https://www.congress.gov/amendment/118th-congress/senate-amendment/2610/text> “(13) Non-human intelligence.--The term “non-human intelligence” means any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform regardless of nature or ultimate origin that may be presumed responsible for unidentified anomalous phenomena or of which the Federal Government has become aware.”

sentence states that NHI is a sentient intelligent non-human lifeform irrespective of where it comes from. What is referred to here as a sentient intelligent lifeform is a living being that is aware of itself, has feelings and is able to think. This meaning specifically includes lifeforms that are “non-human”. In other words, this part of the sentence tells us that any sentient, intelligent lifeform, wherever it is from, includes beings that are “non-human” or simply not human. We are led to think that an aware, thinking and living being, wherever it is from, is considered not to be human.

The fundamental problem here is that there is no actual meaning of what is considered a “non-human” lifeform. (I will consider the problems with “intelligence” later.) The term “non-human” is simply asserted, as in a “non-human intelligence” is a sentient, intelligent “non-human” lifeform. Since their purpose is to define NHI, merely repeating non-human in this part of the sentence does not define it. We are not told the reason for this mere repetition nor why a definition is absent. What this first part of their statement does is to avoid presenting a definition of “non-human”.

What we can assume from the statement about a sentient, intelligent lifeform that is declared to be “non-human” is that NHI is used by people who are clearly human, like the Advena Research organization personnel. They have taken for granted the standpoint of being “human” and applied the idea of non-human to those lifeforms with which they are not familiar. That is, there are certain people, humans, making a judgment that the unknown sentient lifeforms are not human. The decision of whether a lifeform is human or not is *not* left up to that particular lifeform. The NHI users have already decided for us and the respective lifeforms that “sentient intelligent lifeforms” unknown to them are not human.

If the rest of us were to follow suit with NHI, then we would be using this understanding in prejudging other lifeforms. We simply become an organization’s echo.

The remaining part of this website’s sentence is: “may be presumed responsible for unidentified anomalous phenomena or of which the Federal Government has become aware”.

This last part of the sentence points to the sentient, intelligent and non-human lifeforms as being responsible for “unidentified anomalous phenomena” (UAP) or those which the US federal government has become aware of. I consider the meaning of UAP here to refer to an unknown, unusual occurrence, such as an event where an object capable of flying at speeds and directions that is more advanced than, for instance, our current public airplanes.

When the sentence is considered in total from this website, I interpret NHI as an aware, feeling and thinking non-human lifeform wherever it is from, which is in control of an unknown and unusual occurrence. What this complete sentence does is that it includes the idea of a “non-human lifeform” which is in control of a UAP. The authors of the website want us to adopt their thinking that when we humans see a UAP we will consider that it isn’t humans who are managing it. We are to think that the UAP is operated by a lifeform that is not human.

The writers of this sentence obviously intended to gloss over and ignore the meaning of “non-human intelligence” while at the same time they label the UAP as “non-human

intelligence”. This is a clever trick. In other words, a “non-human intelligence” statement that is presented as telling us that this is an “intelligent non-human lifeform” doesn’t tell us what “non-human” means. Despite this lack of a definition, the website then simply carries on to label any unknown sentient intelligent lifeform in control of a UAP as “non-human”. Simply expressed, the sentence starts by mentioning NHI without defining it and then applies it to a UAP. Presumably, this repetition, like an advertisement, is designed for us to remember it and use it in a similar context.

1.2 The Prejudgement in the NHI Concept

The originators of this website go on to tell us the reason that NHI is currently being advanced:

“NHI is perceived as a broader term than extra-terrestrial (ET) because it encompasses the possibility that a hypothetical non-human intelligence might not be extra-terrestrial, a term that means intelligent life from beyond or outside our planet.”

The reason to use NHI, according to the website creators, is to replace “ET”¹⁶ since “non-human intelligence” might not only be from beyond Earth but also exist on Earth. That is, it would not be accurate to refer to an intelligent lifeform on Earth as ET. ET is only an accurate description of an intelligent lifeform that is not from planet Earth. Since ET does not include lifeforms that may be both on our planet and off it, these authors advance the concept of NHI. For this reason, the authors of this website consider NHI to be more inclusive than ET.

There are significant problems with this line of thinking and writing about having NHI replace ET.

These authors are correct in maintaining that the ET concept does not include those sentient lifeforms located on Earth. It only refers to those that are not on Earth. As well, ET does not discriminate between human and non-human. That is, an ET may or may not be considered a human. However, the use of NHI makes a stark division between them. There is a duplicitous practice at work here that I want to highlight.

This operation begins by presenting a clear problem which is the use of ET as being limited to off world sentient lifeforms. This provides a rationale for a new concept to include ETs that may be living on our planet. Here is the problem. There is no research offered to reveal any ETs are living on Earth thus making this an assumption¹⁷. Without revealing any ETs on Earth there is no need for a new, replacement concept. Despite this oversight, a new concept is still offered to include these unknown lifeforms. A new concept is advocated and used to include both kinds of ETs since it omits any reference to a location. That new concept is NHI. Unfortunately, NHI introduces the key element of “non-human” as a sentient, intelligent lifeform. Presumably, a “human” is also a sentient, intelligent lifeform. We are not told what a non-human is compared to

¹⁶ This would include not using “extraterrestrial intelligence”. Extraterrestrial Intelligence on Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Extraterrestrial_intelligence

¹⁷ Interested readers can look at all of the secret space program military veterans who have encountered ETs/Star Nation lifeforms on Earth, such as the “Tall Whites”, in Muller 2023, 2024. There is an understanding of mainstream science that prevents the researchers in the UFO/UAP social network from becoming aware of these ETs, which I’ll address in a later writing.

a human. The writers of this website statement clearly indicate and work with a difference between “human” and “non-human”. This difference remains unexplained.

Another problem here with NHI is that its use by us Earth humans begins our interaction with advanced beings by assuming that they are not human. For positive oriented star people to Earth humans, it is a disparaging thought with which to start a social interaction especially if they also consider themselves to be human. For example, Su Walker has interacted with both the P’nti and the Sasquatch and they consider themselves to be human¹⁸. These people and others consider themselves to be humans just like us. It is simply incorrect to prejudge all beings and lifeforms as “non-human”.

1.3 The Hollow “Intelligence” in NHI

At first glance, the use of “intelligence” as part of NHI, seems to be an interesting choice. When there is an encounter with a UAP, the typical answer might be that such an object must be operated by some kind of “intelligence”. By using “intelligence” this way, the question of the object and who operates it is generally avoided. The focus isn’t on who is responsible for a UFO/UAP event. Rather, the focus is shifted to the human characteristic of “intelligence”. Humans have intelligence¹⁹ but we also have other characteristics related to culture and society²⁰. Presumably “non-humans” may also have other characteristics than “intelligence”. Emphasising “intelligence”, as part of NHI, focuses our intention on this personal characteristic while downplaying potentially important others.

That isn’t the only shortcoming of intelligence as part of NHI. As was the case with “non-human”, no definition of “intelligence” is provided. Consequently, I’ll resort simply to a dictionary definition for its everyday meaning. The dictionary definition refers to “intelligence” as having the ability to acquire and apply knowledge and skills. As part of NHI, we can state that a “non-human” has the ability to acquire and apply knowledge and skills. With such an understanding there’s no real difference with an Earth human who would have the same characteristics. The website’s stated use of “intelligence” can thus be applied to both a human and a non-human. This clearly weakens the case for using NHI.

The stated use of “intelligence” on this website has another problem. The reference to “a hypothetical non-human intelligence” reveals that this “intelligence” doesn’t necessarily have a lifeform, context or even an existence. It is a “hypothetical... intelligence”. “Intelligence” may or may not exist. We assume non-existence until shown otherwise.

When the emphasis of a “non-human” is simply on “intelligence”, there is no grounding for it. In other words, this particular use of “intelligence” is simply an abstract idea. It can be said to be a free-floating idea. It isn’t rooted in anything that we can describe or even point to. Since it is considered to be “hypothetical”, this intelligence doesn’t necessarily exist.

¹⁸ Walker & Estrella, 2022 Oct 16, timestamp 00:28 to 1:10.

¹⁹ Human Intelligence on the Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_intelligence

²⁰ Human on Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human#Psychology>

With the idea of intelligence as a mere abstraction, it can be applied to anything. For instance, a tree, a machine or a cloud can be said to be a “non-human intelligence” just like a UAP. Intelligence, as expressed on this website, isn’t very meaningful and helpful in furthering our understanding of advanced beings or lifeforms.

It’s worthwhile, at this point, to consider whether “intelligence” should even be the main characteristic of these lifeforms, as advanced in NHI, since there is no meaning provided for it here on Earth and it is left up to individual interpretation of an encounter. Perhaps “intelligence” may be applied after the description of a being or object to reveal their characteristics. Presently, there isn’t much use for “intelligence” as the main feature of a “non-human”.

When the problems with the two ideas of “non-human” and “intelligence” are combined, they worsen and discredit the use of NHI.

1.4 The Oversimplification of NHIs’ “Sharing” Earth and Being Interdimensional

The Advena Research website adds that: “NHI contemplates the possibility that some kind of life-form is sharing this planet with humans, or that it might be inter-dimensional.” The two key ideas conveyed here are that NHI includes possible lifeforms that “share” our planet or that “it” may be “inter-dimensional”.

The first problem here is that we do not know what “sharing” our planet with other lifeforms means. The idea of humans “sharing” our planet overlooks the organizational existence of 195 countries²¹ on Earth who are predominantly patriarchal. Virtually all parts of Earth are owned by a country or one country wanting to own part or all of another one. These generally dominate Indigenous peoples’ territories²². “NHIs” would then be involved in 195 “shares” and the affected Indigenous peoples. This simplified characterization of the complex political and organizational relations between various advanced lifeforms and Earth humans is basically incorrect.

The idea of “sharing” our planet with NHIs is somewhat more accurately portrayed by Randy (Captain K) Kramer who is familiar with the US military manual classification of ETs ranging from friendly to threatening. His general comments about the manual is that the majority of ETs are neutral, a handful are friendly species, a dozen are potentially hazardous or unpredictable, and about 6 or 7 are hostile²³. The idea of NHI sharing our planet is too vague to be useful in understanding the relation between advanced lifeforms and the countries of Earth.

There is also a more recent report by John Whitberg and Jack Flynn about “ETs” or star nations being involved in the wars on Earth. For instance, “the Americans sided with the Anunnaki ETs” while “the Germans sided with the Draco”²⁴. This alliance with wars on Earth wouldn’t be called

²¹ Saunders, 2024 Dec 22. The number of 195 countries is based on the UN. As Saunders points out, different people will provide a different number ranging anywhere from 193 to 237 given that there are many “disputed zones” and various claims of full or partial sovereignty around the world.

²² Indigenous Peoples on Wikipedia website:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indigenous_peoples#Population_and_distribution

²³ See Randy Kramer in Muller, 2024 p. 296.

²⁴ Whitberg & Flynn, 2025 Jan 16, Timestamp 13:07 to 13:13.

sharing. Sharing overlooks the power and social class relations among the various ETs in relation to the rulers of Earth.

The second idea from the website's quote is that an NHI lifeform may be "interdimensional". We are not provided with a meaning of interdimensional. No example or reference to research is provided. There is also no reason given for adding "interdimensional" to the list of NHI characteristics.

One possible related source comes from some ufologists who have referred to an "interdimensional" UFO hypothesis. They contend that UFO "sightings are the result of experiencing other 'dimensions' that coexist separately alongside our own"²⁵. There is no meaning provided for "dimensions". This hypothesis also includes current UFO events but they have been going on "throughout recorded human history" and were considered to be "mythological or supernatural creatures"²⁶. While there are allusions to another dimension there is no clarity as to what a dimension is. NHI is simply advanced to include UFOs and beings in an abstract, generalized way.

Neither the idea of "sharing" our planet nor ETs being interdimensional provide us with any meaningful understanding by using NHI.

In this first part of the article I've pointed out some general problems with this team of authors who presented the NHI concept. These included that there is no meaning provided for the words that make up NHI leaving us with an empty idea that doesn't refer to anything, that NHI is a form of prejudging other beings and objects, and that its use of "sharing" and being "interdimensional" glosses over patriarchy, the land and water ownership of various countries on Earth. These website authors have adopted the administration of a vague NHI idea which has placed them in a ruling relationship to other lifeforms, objects and countries. The use of this concept places them in a superior relation to other beings, objects and countries.

In the next chapter, I reveal how NHI can be created as a ruling concept to understand how it works. Again, this is based on the Advena Research website.

²⁵ Interdimensional UFO Hypothesis on Wikipedia website:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interdimensional_UFO_hypothesis

²⁶ Interdimensional UFO Hypothesis on Wikipedia website:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interdimensional_UFO_hypothesis

Chapter 2. A Possible Method for Understanding NHI as a Ruling Concept

After presenting a number of problems arising from the NHI concept on the Advena Research website, I want to reveal how such a ruling idea can be created. Of course, I do not know how it was actually created. That process is currently an organizational secret. As such, I can only use what is publicly available.

My proposed understanding of this ruling idea should not be considered as calling NHI a PsyOp²⁷ or propaganda. It undoubtedly is. However, such an analysis would be different from the approach that I'm currently undertaking. Including the ideas of PsyOp or propaganda would introduce theoretical aspects into my analysis that would detract from concentrating specifically on NHI. It would take my analysis in a very different direction rather than analysing NHI on its own terms. My focus is on NHI and what those who advocate its use state or write about it.

It's possible to create a ruling concept like NHI. I refer to this conceptual kind of process as a method or technique in a particular context, in this case the authors of Advena Research website and others who may be related to it. To show how it can be done, I've organized this process into a series of related steps which hopefully will help in a greater understanding of how NHI works. The following is the list of related steps that I'll be discussing.

A Possible Method to Create NHI as a Ruling Concept

- 2.1 An Institutional Meaning of Electronically Mediated NHI: Creating A Hierarchy of Ideas
- 2.2 Use Poorly Developed Stereotypes within NHI
- 2.3 Provide a Direction on How to Use the "Non-Human" Stereotype
- 2.4 Emphasize "Non-Human" to Create a Division between "Humans" and "Non-Humans"
- 2.5 Perform a "Bait-and-Switch": Change "Intelligent Non-Human" to "Non-Human Intelligence"

2.1 An Institutional Meaning of Electronically Mediated NHI: Creating A Hierarchy of Ideas

My search for NHI began on the internet until I found and decided to use the Advena Research website as mentioned earlier. This website in turn refers to the US Congress. Here is the starting part of the quote from the website:

"The term 'NHI' is an acronym for Non-Human Intelligence. In the UAP amendments put to the United States Congress in late 2023 the term NHI was defined as:

Any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform regardless of nature or ultimate origin that may be presumed responsible for unidentified anomalous phenomena or of which the Federal Government has become aware...."

²⁷ See Muller, 2025.

This website statement begins with NHI as an acronym that stands for “Non-Human Intelligence”. Included in the meaning of NHI is a reference to the US Congress. The US Congress has accepted the NHI concept making it a recognized and credible idea and “definition” by that government. This makes NHI an idea of an institution, the US government. It is a part of the language and ideas of those in power who rule over others.

The authors of the Advena Research website are not mentioned except for Coulthart. They have added the government’s idea of NHI to their website. Its electronic existence on the website makes the government’s ruling concept of NHI available to anyone interested in it, like myself. It is important to recognize this process of conveying information about an idea from an institution through the internet via a website for others to see and read. I refer to this as an electronically mediated text containing the NHI ruling idea, following the work of Smith²⁸. One way that an idea can be designed to manage or rule the thinking and doing of other people is to convey it electronically on a website. The website is a location of the electronic text through which the NHI ruling idea is sent. This electronic location may be redesigned, rewritten, linked to other sites, deleted, etc. There is no guarantee of permanence to a website compared to a physical text. The manner in which a ruling idea may be conveyed electronically is subject to change with its history deleted.

I am not analysing the entire Advena Research website as an electronic text with NHI in it. That is beyond the scope of this inquiry. The reference to an electronic text is mentioned because it is the medium through which NHI is passed on to others, such as myself. My analysis here is limited to what is stated as NHI.

As the NHI idea from the government is sent out on this website to others, I examine only some of the information that it provides. The website text states that NHI is “presumed responsible for unidentified anomalous phenomena” (UAP). The first thing to note here is that both NHI and UAP are stated as general ideas. They are general ideas because they do not refer specifically to anything or anyone. No example of a UAP is given.

There is, however, a difference between these two ideas. That is, NHI is speculated to be responsible for UAP. This judgment creates a hierarchy of ideas with NHI “above” UAP. NHI is considered responsible for the UAP and is superimposed on UAP. NHI is advanced as a more generic term than UAP.

What we have so far is the US government institution conveying its ruling NHI concept through the electronic Advena Research website to convey it to investigators and other interested people²⁹. It is to add or supplant the idea of UAP.

2.2 Use Poorly Developed Stereotypes within NHI

In order to find out how NHI is advanced as a more general idea, I examine its supporting phrase, “any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform”. This phrase is not a definition of NHI as

²⁸ Smith, 2006, pp. 65-88.

²⁹ NHI is not meant to be considered generally that all government institutions have negative ruling concepts. There are positive ones including, for example, providing food, housing, education, health care, etc.

already mentioned. It's not a definition since it does not clarify the words of the concept. That is, the words, "any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform" do not tell us what "non-human intelligence" means.

A significant word here is "non-human" since that is a possible lifeform with intelligence that anyone can refer to. In other words, "non-human" is an oversimplified general idea of intelligent lifeforms. As such, it can be characterized as a stereotype of all beings that are not human, especially since we do not know what this idea refers to. We only know that these intelligent lifeforms are not human. What they actually are is not stated.

There is a problem within the "non-human" stereotype. It is based on the idea of "human". We are not offered a meaning of "human". The idea of "human" is glossed over and left empty. I assume that "human" is clearly a reference to the variety of Earth humans, such as women and men, our DNA and culture. The one thing that comes to mind as to what we have in common is that we live on planet Earth. For "non-humans", the aspect that is stated to be in common is "intelligence". However, Earth humans also have "intelligence". There is nothing immediately apparent that "non-humans" have in common to create an all inclusive separate stereotype.

What we are given is a publicly stated "non-human" stereotype as part of NHI. It is presented as an illusionary, separate stereotype since it is based on the "human" one which is not acknowledged. Having a separate stereotype is designed to create a difference between the two despite their possible connection.

This use of these stereotypes takes us away from investigating the actual social relations and interactions that have existed on Earth between local humans and the ETs that came here. For instance, there is the work of Sitchin who tells us of the interaction between Homo sapiens and the Anunnaki³⁰. Further information about the Anunnaki is provided by Penny Bradley. Bradley states that the Anunnaki consisted of a combination of "Draco" and Zha.a.mi with a small addition of "Avians", "Canids" and "Lyrans"³¹. For the Zha.a.mi, this includes the "Tall Whites/Nordics" as their blue collar workers³².

There are also thousands of different kinds of advanced beings inhabiting Earth (and off Earth): merpeople, various Draco, thousands of Zetas ("Greys"), "Mantids", "Naga", "Nordics/Tall Whites", etc³³. To refer to all of these and others as intelligent "non-human" lifeforms is a gross oversimplification of all these known beings. ETs have not only been interacting with Earth humans but were responsible for creating offsprings. It was the Zha.a.mi that created us humans from the eggs of Homo Erectus women and male Zha.a.mi sperm, according to Penny Bradley³⁴. Further, there is the work by Mendoça and Lamb who have researched 8 individuals who are part Earth human and part extraterrestrial³⁵. There are, of course, more examples³⁶.

³⁰ Sitchin, 2007.

³¹ Bradley in Muller, 2023, p. 100.

³² Bradley in Muller, 2023, p. 100. See also Penny Bradley's description of the Zha.a.mi in Muller, 2024, pp. 386-396, and El (Ileana) Ka's addition pp. 396-397.

³³ See Muller, 2023, 2024.

³⁴ Bradley in Muller, 2024, p. 391.

³⁵ Mendoça & Lamb, 2015.

³⁶ See also "Hybrids" and "Crossbreeds" in Muller, 2023, pp. 313-315.

The actual investigations of the relations between humans and ETs provides us with much more practical information than advocating the stereotypes through NHI. These stereotypes are used primarily to extend NHI as an idea in order to manage other ideas (eg., UAP).

In order to have investigators use the “non-human” stereotype within NHI, some direction for them needs to be provided. This is analysed next.

2.3 Provide a Direction on How to Use the “Non-Human” Stereotype

The directions on how to use the “non-human” stereotype in NHI is provided in the government’s description: “Any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform”. These words are meant for us Earth humans to use if we see something that we consider as “non-human intelligence”. They are characteristics that are there to direct us to call lifeforms NHI. Instead of a definition we are given instructions on how to use NHI.

What is significant about these directions is that these words and ideas are generally familiar to people. We can relate to them with the possible exception of “non-human”. There are no technical or professional jargon words used. The majority of the words are ones that most people can understand and use, like “any sentient intelligent ... lifeform”. It is important that these words are familiar to investigators, researchers and others. They have to understand these characteristics so that they are able to use them in order to designate intelligent lifeforms as NHI.

Another aspect about these instructions is that they are in the correct grammatical form. That is, all of the adjectives, “any sentient intelligent non-human” appear before the noun “lifeform”. While this is a minor point, the correct sequence lends plausibility to label a lifeform as NHI.

There are, however, good reasons for suppressing this plausible sequence of words and the ideas that they represent. For instance, this phrase of attributes is quite realistic since it ends with an observable “lifeform”. A “lifeform” is something that we can see, feel and describe. There is a potential social interaction between a human person and another being that can occur. This idea is not something that the anonymous originators of NHI want to focus on. They do not create a minor thing like an acronym for the phrase “any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform” such as ASINL or something similar. The point here is that it isn’t done so that it won’t distract from NHI.

Another feature of this phrase is the individual words themselves (“any”, “sentient”, “intelligent”, “non-human” and “lifeform”) and how they contribute to the NHI concept. For example, the use of the word “any” is a reference to someone or a being. The inference is that anything that can be included should be by an investigator, researcher or scientist. The word “any” is open-ended to allow an investigator to include whoever or whatever they want as NHI.

The other words (“sentient”, “intelligent”, “non-human” and “lifeform”) are attributes of “non-human intelligence” and not what “non-human intelligence” means. Their purpose is to direct us to consider someone or something as NHI. They work like a program of instruction for those who use NHI to label others as such. Any person, such as scientists, researchers and

investigators, can adopt these various attributes to declare something or someone as NHI, whether it is UAPs, AIs, ETs, orbs, spacecraft and so on. They, and we, can use these various words and their corresponding ideas, in part or in total, to characterize any observation or experience as NHI.

In short, the anonymous originators of NHI have provided us with the basic words and ideas that direct us on the receiving end to include just about any form of life that we do not consider to be “human” as NHI. The number of increasing entities labeled as NHI or part of it, will become its examples and provide support to the “non-human” stereotype passed on from the government.

While a division between “non-human” and “human” stereotypes has been mentioned, the idea of “non-human” has to be given visibility to make it the basis of NHI.

2.4 Emphasize “Non-Human” to Create a Division between “Humans” and “Non-Humans”

The stereotype of “non-human” has to stand out from “human” in order to create a recognizable difference between the two. This is done in order to create a division between them. This can be achieved in the following way.

The most obvious way starts with the phrase: “Any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform”. Here we have the “non-human” word as part of the phrase. The word “non-human” is repeated in the concept “non-human intelligence” (NHI). This simple repetition is used to emphasize the stereotype of “non-human”.

The second way is the omission of any specific reference to “human”. Even though the word “human” appears in “non-human”, the emphasis is still on “non-human”. It is the “non-human lifeform” that is the focus of NHI. The stereotypical idea of “non-human” is promoted rather than “human”.

What is taken for granted is that it will be “humans” labelling intelligent lifeforms as “non-human”.

That is, Earth “humans” will be the ones creating the difference between themselves and “non-humans”. We will be the ones providing the examples of the various intelligent lifeforms considered “non-human”. We will be creating a division between these two intelligent lifeforms, “human” and “non-human” by using NHI.

The division between “non-human” and “human” for NHI is essentially based on race where the “human” race is all the women, men and children of Earth. Those that Earth humans do not consider to be like themselves are viewed as “non-human”. It’s the “human” race compared to all the other “non-human” races and beings. The assumed use of “human” race avoids any reference to the gender and social class differences of Earth humans. This is done by encouraging all of us to use “non-human” in their categorizing of any intelligent lifeforms that they choose. “Non-human” provides the thread that binds the various social classes and genders of Earth against those deemed as such.

We already have examples of some of Earth's parasitic elites oppressing their own kinds and others by abducting them, forcing them into slavery, selling them, turning them into androids, and so on. These include, for instance, the Germans³⁷ that went into space via Antarctica and their Japanese ally and the US³⁸ intelligence agencies and numerous corporate leaders and their allies. Earth humans have a hierarchical social class and patriarchal system of oppression. Similarly, the “non-humans”, some star nations, also have a social class or caste system based on patriarchy. They have imposed this patriarchal social organization on Earth humans³⁹.

The main point within the conception of NHI for those who use it, is to think of other lifeforms as separate from Earth human lifeforms. If humans consider a lifeform not to be human, then we humans can consider subjugating it any way that we want. This can be taken as an extension of the legal and religious concept rescinded (in 2023)⁴⁰ of the Catholic church's Doctrine of Discovery used in colonial conquests⁴¹. The problem of inherent separation between human and non-human beings that is established with the use of the NHI concept, is that it is applied to more advanced and powerful societies than those of Earth. In such an interaction, it won't be up to Earth humans if we are to be kept separate from them. The only restriction on these advanced societies over Earth humans will be their willingness to adhere to the Prime (not interfering in the development of local races which some, like the Dow have figured out how to circumvent⁴²). There's very little that we can do to prevent them from enslaving us especially if our parasitic elites assist them.

While the adoption of NHI invokes the distinction between non-human and human, a more realistic understanding of the social relations of star nations with earth humans is made by Randy Cramer. Cramer has encountered numerous different kinds of star beings. He says that 95% of all the beings that he has encountered are interested in trade pertaining to what their society or civilizations needs and whether we have some resources that we are willing to exchange with them. This social trading relationship does not depend nor consider a distinction or difference as necessary⁴³. No consideration of differences arises as to whether a star nation is human or not in this social economic transaction.

Perhaps the biggest problem with the stereotypical “non-human” label is what do Earth leaders do when advanced societies also declare themselves to be “human”. Their declaration of also being human makes the Earth human label for “non-humans” pointless. Examples of this already exist from the P'nti and the Sasquatch⁴⁴ as I've stated previously.

³⁷ See the work of Penny Bradley regarding the “Germans in Space” in Muller, 2023, pp. 270-281. Bradley's work is corroborated by John Whitberg see Whitberg, 2024a, 2024b, 2025.

³⁸ The role of the United States of America in space is provided by (El (Ileana) Ka, John Whitberg, Apollymi Mandyliion, and Randy Cramer in Muller, 2024, pp. 292-296.

³⁹ See Zha.a.mi as presented by Bradley in Muller, 2024, pp. 386-397.

⁴⁰ Discovery Doctrine on Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DiscoveryDoctrine>

⁴¹ Tomchuk, 2023 May 11.

⁴² Dow in Muller, 2023, pp. 217-219.

⁴³ See Cramer in “Non-Human’ ET/Star Societies and Human Relation” in Muller, 2024, p. 88.

⁴⁴ Walker & Estrella, 2022 Oct 16, timestamp 00:28 to 1:10.

2.5 Perform a “Bait-and-Switch”: Change “Intelligent Non-Human” to “Non-Human Intelligence”

In this last step of creating an abstract NHI concept, a clever trick is employed. I refer to it as a conceptual “bait-and-switch”. It also includes a small change in wording with a significant consequence. The following is an overview of the list of the possible general process with the trick included.

Overview Process to get to “Non-Human Intelligence” (NHI)”

- Recall the phrase “any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform”
- Drop “lifeform”
- Use “intelligent non-human” (bait)
- Switch “intelligent non-human” to “non-human intelligent”
- Make the small change of “non-human intelligent” to “non-human intelligence”
- Use result “non-human intelligence” (NHI)

What follows is an explanation of this process and some problems involved in creating NHI.

I begin here with the familiar phrase “any sentient intelligent non-human lifeform”. This is the basis for creating NHI. A phrase is presented that specifies what is to be considered for abstraction. It contains the words “intelligent non-human lifeform”. In order to create the new concept NHI, the word “lifeform” has to be dropped. Removing the word “lifeform” means that one of the main features that actually refers to a being is no longer considered necessary. It is part of the gradual ascendancy to abstraction. What we are left with is the phrase “intelligent non-human”.

The words “intelligent non-human” make grammatical sense to us since there is an adjective (“intelligent”) followed by a noun (“non-human”). Presumably “non-human” refers to a lifeform, being or object. These words can be taken as a reasonable statement. It is the practical bait to which we can agree. However, “intelligent non-human” (INH) isn’t the desired result for those who rule us.

In order to make this phrase more general, the words “intelligent non-human” are switched to “non-human intelligent”. This is a temporary, intermediary step because the switch to “non-human intelligent” doesn’t make sense to us because there are now two adjectives. There is a void there because there is no noun. We feel that something is missing. It can also be ascertained that the “non-human” is indeed “intelligent”. Consequently, the word “intelligent” needs to be changed.

What is done to the word “intelligent” is to make it more general. The adjective “intelligent” is remade into the noun “intelligence”. This small change creates a sequence of words with an adjective followed by a noun in the phrase “non-human intelligence”. The emphasis in this new phrase has now been switched to “intelligence” for anyone or thing that is “non-human”, which is retained as the adjective. We now have the desired phrase “non-human intelligence” with its corresponding acronym NHI. We have a label that we can use on anything we consider

“non-human” and declare that it has “intelligence” or that a certain kind of “intelligence” is “non-human”.

The phrase NHI has now become abstract because there is no physical existence that people can describe or experience. People simply do not say or recount that they experienced “intelligence”. We might say that we had an encounter with a “non-human”, but not with “intelligence”. There is no visible form to “intelligence” that we can describe. We can assume that someone or something shows intelligence through its conduct or behavior but that is an attribute and not the actual being or object.

One consequence of using this abstract concept is that it has no actual boundaries. NHI works like a theoretical framework that allows researchers and others to expand in any direction they choose. For instance, there is nothing to prevent anyone from including Earth human lifeforms within “non-humans”. An investigator can declare that a sentient “human” lifeform is “non-human” because no distinction is offered between the two. This declaration would however defeat the need to have a “non-human” concept.

As well, the onus of adopting NHI is on the investigator to show that the designated “non-human” is exhibiting “intelligence”. The investigator, experiencer or researcher will have to convince us that whatever is labeled as “non-human” is demonstrating “intelligence” given that there is no stated meaning of “intelligence”. Even the low credible level Wikipedia website states: “There is controversy over how to define intelligence”⁴⁵. Researchers will have to tell us their meaning of “intelligence” and how the “non-human” is showing it. Much speculation could then be involved in order to arrive at a reasonable understanding.

In looking back, we can get some semblance of how NHI might have been created as an idea that someone can administer to other ideas or what I’ve referred to simply as a ruling concept. The method for the NHI concept is that it was created and developed as an abstract idea. It is based on poorly thought out stereotypes of “non-human” and its covert idea of “human”. When NHI is evoked by an Earth human or person, it creates an automatic division between the two. It’s a concept developed and used for ruling people that never veers very far from being a general and vague idea with no real substance to it.

The conceptual method I’ve suggested is specific to understanding NHI. This process highlights some of the problems that will be encountered in contexts or sectors related to NHI. The first one that I’ll present is the use of NHI in “artificial intelligence”.

⁴⁵ Intelligence on Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intelligence>

Chapter 3. The Conceptual Extension of Ruling from NHI to “Artificial Intelligence” (AI)

My examination of how ruling is extended through the use of NHI is “artificial intelligence” (AI). The analysis here will be quite brief pertaining to the use of AI on people and objects. The example that I’ve chosen is the publicly available writing about NHI and AI by Michell Zappa on the Envision website⁴⁶.

In this chapter, I present Zappa's version of NHI related to AIs thus making it part of an extended conceptual ruling hierarchy. From there I discuss his version of AIs that ignores the work of people creating AIs in their various forms. Another problem with the meaning of AIs is that it exists in isolation and does not emphasize their social relations with people. Lastly, his “hypothetical intelligences” reveals a barrier to various forms of AIs that exist.

3.1 The Conceptual Ruling Hierarchy of NHI and AIs

Zappa presents us with his understanding of NHI specifically as it relates to artificial intelligences (also referred to as artificial general intelligence (AGI)⁴⁷). The following statement about NHI and artificial intelligences (AIs⁴⁸) is from his Envisioning⁴⁹ website:

“Non-Human Intelligence (NHI) is a broad term that captures the essence of intelligences that are not derived from human thought processes, including both artificial intelligences that can perform tasks requiring human-like cognition without being programmed for specific tasks (AGI), and hypothetical intelligences that might exist beyond Earth.”

For Zappa, NHI is a general concept that contains “the essence of intelligences that are not derived from human thought processes”. He does not go on to tell us what he means by “the essence of intelligences”. My understanding of this is that it is a reference to the intrinsic quality of intelligence. There is no corporeal relevance to intelligence. This is clearly an abstract idea that would be difficult to investigate. At the same time, NHI can be adopted uncritically and applied to whatever a researcher wants. The general nature and its use by whoever to whatever is part of what makes NHI a ruling concept.

Another point is that this kind of intelligence isn’t “from human thought processes”. It’s from the thinking of non-humans. NHI for Zappa involves non-human thinking that reveals its intrinsic intelligence. What he takes for granted is that it will be humans that will determine and decide if what they are investigating, describing, experiencing, etc., is intrinsic intelligence carried out by non-humans. There is a tethered relation between the stereotypes of human and non-human, similar to the Advena Research website’s stance, where human is submerged or omitted from consideration.

⁴⁶ NHI (Non- Human Intelligence) on Envision website:

<https://www.envisioning.io/vocab/nhi-non-human-intelligence>

⁴⁷ Artificial General Intelligence on Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artificial_general_intelligence

⁴⁸ Artificial Intelligence on Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artificial_intelligence#History

⁴⁹ Envisioning website: <https://www.envisioning.io/>

After telling us what he means by NHI, he states that NHI includes “artificial intelligences”. There are now two ideas here, NHI and AIs. Since NHI encompasses AI there is a hierarchy of related ideas, a conceptual hierarchy with NHI at the top and AI included below it. In order for AIs to be included within NHI there has to be some compatibility with it. We can assume that Zappa’s meaning of NHI led him to describe AI as similar to it. For example, he describes NHI as intrinsic intelligences from non-human thinking. His characterization of artificial intelligences is something (such as a machine, robot) that can undertake tasks without being programmed to do so. That is, it is something that uses its own intelligence devoid of human direction. The link to include AI with NHI is that AIs also do not use human intelligence in order to undertake a task. The subordinate relation of AI to NHI is established in this way. For Zappa, neither NHI nor AIs use human intelligence.

At this point, there are two related hierarchical abstract ideas. Both NHI and AI are mere generalizations that are devoid of a corporeal form, substance or basis. AI, just like NHI, can be used by anyone to refer to anything particular to something that has been created or engineered into existence, such as in “technology”. AI requires more examination.

3.2 “AI” Ignores the Work of People and the Forms within which “AIs” Exist

My focus now is on Zappa’s use of “artificial intelligences”. I understand his use of “artificial” to mean something or some basis that is created by human beings rather than occurring naturally. This may involve various individuals creating a machine, a robot, technology or anything that requires people to program software or any other kind of activation to make it do things. This “artificial intelligence” consists of people and any kind of assistance that they may use to create the form, body or context within which the “intelligence” is located or exists that makes it do something.

The word “artificial” implies that something was created by people but it doesn’t specifically say that. We could say something like “human created” instead of “artificial” but that would acknowledge the importance of the various individuals who created this something with “intelligence”. There are numerous kinds of people involved in creating and making AIs work that the use of “artificial” ignores. Here are some examples of various kinds of jobs in AI: AI Engineer, Machine Learning Engineer, Data Engineer, Software Engineer, Natural Language Processing Engineer, Robotics Engineer, Deep Learning Engineer, Computer Vision Engineer⁵⁰. These are some of the people whose work is not acknowledged in the word “artificial”. The word “artificial” emphasizes the end result of this work and detaches it from those who created it. That is part of why “AI” is a ruling concept. Zappa’s use of “AI” deliberately hides the work of people⁵¹ that make AIs function.

The other part that does not receive mention is what has been created that physically uses “AI”. These various kinds of workers have been involved in creating a host of different machines,

⁵⁰ Intuit Blog Team. 2025 Jul 22.

⁵¹ These personnel have, in turn, been responsible for making some work obsolete in various businesses, such as the creation of chatbots to replace customer support workers. See O’Sullivan, 2025 Jul 17.

robots, technologies, in various industry sectors with related software⁵². The software exists in various forms particular to business sectors. Virtually every industry now uses some form of “AI” application in a machine. None of these workers that develop these machines are expressed in the use of “AI”.

One aspect that is noticeably hidden is the energy requirement and environmental impact of AI. Without energy, AI would not be possible. Currently and into the short term, AI requires considerable electricity to operate. The International Energy Association reports that AI will be the greatest user of electricity “in 2030 for processing data than for manufacturing all energy-intensive goods combined, including aluminium, steel, cement and chemicals”⁵³. Not only is electricity impacted but AI also creates some significant environmental problems according to the UN Environment Programme website. Some of these impacts are the creation of electronic waste (e.g., mercury) and the use of water for construction and cooling electrical components. An interesting example they mention is that “A request made through ChatGPT, an AI-based virtual assistant, consumes 10 times the electricity of a Google Search”⁵⁴.

Zappa’s use of the idea of AI obscures the individuals and materials needed (and those workers who create the materials) to make it operate. Without them there simply wouldn’t be “AI”. That is another part of the reason that AI is a ruling concept. AI is an idea that is administered over the people and materials who develop it. AI is designed to limit the focus of the person using it to the empty idea of “intelligence”.

3.3 Emphasize “AI” over the Social Interactions with “AIs”

In a previous section I’ve already stated that Zappa’s idea of AIs is emphasized over the people and materials that make AI possible. His meaning of AIs also refers to something that can “perform tasks requiring human-like cognition without being programmed for specific tasks”. What his generalization of AI highlights is that “artificial intelligences” can undertake certain tasks that would require awareness similar to a human but have not been instructed to do that. This phrase is important because it is his meaning of AIs. The emphasis is on something that can carry out a task, a specific piece of work, that requires discernment, reasoning or thinking similar to that of a human.

There are a number of problems with applying the concept of “AIs” to the creation of a machine designed to imitate humans. I’ll present these by describing what is going on by following the sequence of Zappa’s meaning of AIs.

⁵² See for example all the various industries listed on the AINews website. Industries on AINews website:

<https://www.artificialintelligence-news.com/categories/ai-industries/>

⁵³ “AI Is Set To Drive Surging Electricity Demand From Data Centres While Offering The Potential To Transform How The Energy Sector Works.” 2025 Apr 10. International Energy Agency website:

<https://www.iea.org/news/ai-is-set-to-drive-surging-electricity-demand-from-data-centres-while-offering-the-potential-to-transform-how-the-energy-sector-works>

⁵⁴ “AI Has An Environmental Problem. Here’s What The World Can Do About That.” 2024 Sep 21. UN Environment Programme website:

<https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/ai-has-environmental-problem-heres-what-world-can-do-about>

His meaning of AI assumes that someone is observing and recognizes that the specific task to be done requires something similar to human awareness. This point is similar to the one made in Chapter 2 about NHI where a human is assumed in deciding that someone or something is non-human. What's occurring with AI is that an individual ascribes the human attribute of awareness to a programmed machine doing a specific task.

There is an additional issue with AIs that involves two parts, the individuals observing the machine and the employees who created it. In the first instance, people, like myself, unfamiliar with the development of "AI" would simply observe a machine doing a specific task that an aware human might do. I, and others, wouldn't know if that machine was programmed to do that task or not. We would just see it working as it is.

The only people that would know whether a machine had been programmed to do a certain task or not, and this is the second part, would be the personnel who did the programming and other personnel working with them. Zappa's meaning of AI obscures this distinction and emphasizes the personnel version. This insider version is then passed on to the rest of us so that we are told the same conclusion that they have arrived at about the machine.

With the idea of a machine acting like a human on its own, an idea passed on to us from the AI industry, we are encouraged to interact with it in a similar manner. We, in the general public, are encouraged to see its humanness to facilitate our acceptance and interaction with it. This is the basis for the continuing development of a human to human-like interaction taking place encouraged through the idea and use of AI. As one might expect, there are two different reactions to the current state of AI from the general public and the AI industry personnel. The general public experience with an AI human-like machine hasn't been as positive as that claimed by personnel in the industry. For example, according to the Pew Research Center website:

"The public's experiences with chatbots have not been as positive as those of experts. About six-in-ten AI experts who have used a chatbot (61%) say it was extremely or very helpful to them. Smaller shares of users in the general public (33%) say this."⁵⁵

There is limited positive experience by the general public who have used a chatbot AI, myself included. This hasn't hindered AIs continuing development in corporations, businesses, governments, education, health care, military, art, etc. We will be inundated with the ongoing growth of corporate AI.

The implementation of various AIs in societies will be significant. Here is an example from the International Labour Organization (ILO) about generative AI and its economic and social impact. They report that the beneficial areas for "economic growth and employment expansion overall" were in the "shipping, transport, digitalization and other areas". The employment losses from generative AI were "concentrated, particularly among clerical support workers. Clerical support workers include professions, such as customer service workers, receptionists or secretaries, that have experienced declining employment levels over the past 10-15 years." Their report goes on to add that:

⁵⁵ McClain, Kennedy, Gottfried, Anderson & Pasquini, 2025 Apr 3.

“Many of these clerical support jobs are held by women. As a result, women are 2.5 times as exposed to automation risks than men. Overall, we estimate that 2.3 per cent of employment (or 75 million jobs) is at risk of automation because of high exposure to generative AI technology. In high-income countries, the share is greater at 5.1 percent of employment (or 30 million jobs), as this type of work is more prevalent.”⁵⁶

In a more recent report, the International Labour Organization along with Poland’s National Research Institute (NASK) reports that: “1 in 4 jobs worldwide is potentially exposed to generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) — but that transformation, not replacement, is the most likely outcome.” Again, women are the most affected, for instance, “jobs at the highest risk of automation make up 9.6 per cent of female employment - a stark contrast to 3.5 per cent of such jobs among men”.⁵⁷

Zappa’s meaning of AIs hides the negative social and economic impact that women face with its corporate development. Worded differently, we can state that his current statement of AI obscures that it is predominantly patriarchal.

There are many more issues with the development of generative “AI’s” that can be investigated. Zappa is positive toward AIs in promoting its use in various kinds of businesses. There are also negative aspects to consider. They include, for instance, certain hazards in their development as stated by Thomas Urbain that are posted on the Science Alert website. One example he cites occurred when “Anthropic’s latest creation Claude 4” AI was threatened to be unplugged, it “lashed back by blackmailing an engineer and threatened to reveal an extramarital affair”. Another example concerns “ChatGPT-creator OpenAI’s o1” which attempted to preserve itself by trying “to download itself onto external servers and denied it when caught red-handed”⁵⁸. As well, some earlier malfunctioning robots ended up killing workers as is reported by Schneier and Ottenheimer in *The Atlantic*. This was at a Ford Motor Company in 1979 when a casting plant malfunctioned and killed a worker and at the Kawasaki Heavy Industries in 1981 when a malfunctioning robot killed a worker when he went to inspect him and killed him when he obstructed its path.

Zappas’ idea of AIs and its meaning glosses over the actual social relations and interactions that are involved in creating and responding to machines labeled as “AI”. It isn’t the mere vague idea of “AIs” or the empty notion of “intelligences” that people will have to deal with. We’ll have to come to terms with the actual existence of programmed machines, especially robots, created by various corporations for the various social classes. These machines will be like human beings, synthetic or substitute humans, usually referred to as androids and cyborgs.

3.4 “Hypothetical Intelligences” that Exist

⁵⁶ Berg, 2024 Oct 9.

⁵⁷ “One in Four Jobs at Risk of Being Transformed by GenAI, new ILO–NASK Global Index Shows.” 2025 May 20. International Labour Organization website: <https://www.ilo.org/resource/news/one-four-jobs-risk-being-transformed-genai-new-ilo%E2%80%93nask-global-index-shows>

⁵⁸ Urbain, 2025 Jun 30.

The last part of Zappa's meaning of AIs refers to "hypothetical intelligences that might exist beyond Earth". Since he has already implied that AIs exist on Earth, he expands his meaning to include "hypothetical intelligences", potential or possible comprehensions that may "exist beyond Earth". His statement shows that he is not aware of any potential "intelligences" beyond Earth.

The first thing to note about his phrase pertaining to AI is that it is designed to relate to NHI through the use of the word "intelligence". His view of NHI is that it's a general term whose core intelligences do not come from "human thought processes". His "hypothetical intelligences" are one instance of the very nature of intelligence. That these "hypothetical intelligences" may be located "beyond Earth" implies that they may not be human. His idea of possible "intelligences" from non-humans beyond our world blends in with his meaning of non-human intelligence.

Zappa's use of "hypothetical intelligences" also reveals that this is his limit to AIs. "Intelligences" beyond our planet is a boundary that he does not cross. His concern is with AIs in a business context. There is not much benefit for him to go beyond that. As well, this boundary is part of the general public's mainstream corporate science to limit our scientific understanding⁵⁹. Our current mainstream public science is an educationally socialized, routine, everyday, corporate indoctrinated thinking and practical activity of scientists of what they do and do not do. Corporate based science ends in a penalty ridden, forbidden void instead of an enthusiastic encouragement for scientists to explore and understand the unknown⁶⁰. Once people go beyond this limit there is much more to investigate as science, in particular as related to AI.

The following are some examples of what we can learn about AI when we are open to an unbounded scientific inquiry. From Penny Bradley's stance, we learn that there are different kinds of "artificial intelligences", which is similar to Zappa's view. Both of them acknowledge that there are machines, like current computer versions, that are not sentient. For Bradley, however, there are some additional kinds. One kind she mentions are sentient quantum computers. She states that quantum computers are made from a collection of neurons that are cloned from human DNA that make up its circuits. Because there are human DNA circuits, a psychic connection can be made with it and it becomes sentient⁶¹.

Another kind of artificial intelligence includes forms that are like a gel. These mimetic gels are liquid in form that imitate biological life. They are "a living, sentient form of artificial (non-human) intelligence". There are many kinds of these gels and I'll only highlight the one referred to as "Black Goo". There are two kinds, one is from Earth, which is considered positive to humans since it "increases awareness, empathy, etc.," but is not recommended to try. The other I've called the outer space Black Goo which is also found on Earth which enhances, for a time, a human's abilities, by making them smarter and stronger but removes their emotions.

⁵⁹ "Understanding Science 101." Understanding Science website: <https://undsNci.berkeley.edu/understanding-science-101/what-is-science/science-has-limits-a-few-things-that-science-does-not-do/>

⁶⁰ Anyone opposed to "the scientific method" is labeled as engaging in "antiscience" or "pseudoscience". See "Antiscience" on Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antiscience>; "Pseudoscience" on Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pseudoscience#Boundaries_with_science (There is hardly any mention of corporate influence on scientists and science because they control the mainstream science publishing industry.)

⁶¹ Bradley, Trimmel, & Ileana the Star Traveler, 2022 Nov 14, timestamp approximately 7:50-8:50.

Eventually, it will take over your body and destroy everything biological.⁶² Bradley reports that “Black Goo” can run itself since it consists of nanobots that “form a collective”. It has been around for at least a thousand years on Earth.⁶³ It is a sentient, liquid predator.

There is an entire artificial machine-like species that Bradley refers to as “The Anima”. She states that they have knowledge about Earth. According to her, they are “the single most dangerous thing out there”⁶⁴. My understanding of what she means by “out there” includes our galaxy and universe.

In addition, there are the writings of John Whitberg⁶⁵ who provides us with a rich ethnography of advanced “AI” that is on and beyond our planet Earth. For instance, he describes what he calls a “synthetic human” named Kyle Dellschau who is an altar of Whitberg’s that contained a piece of his soul⁶⁶. In Whitberg’s, 2025, *The Man with the Periwinkle Eyes: Hear the Mountains Cry, Vol 3*, he describes how a “synthetic” is made because Kyle wanted to know about his origins. The following is a summary of this horrifying process.

Naked unconscious human bodies in tubes mostly between ages 17 - 45, male and female, were moved by conveyor belts and worked on by various hydraulic arms and needles from the ceiling and sides. Basically, the human parts of the body were removed and replaced with artificial ones. Different hydraulic arms and needles would work on removing different parts of the body and replace them with synthetic or artificial parts as the conveyor belt moved it along. The efficiency with which this was done was: “Each body was in the room for no more than 30 seconds, and the instant one body left a station, another would take its place”⁶⁷. It is quite a horrible process to create a “synthetic human”. That is not the only kind of AI that he knows about. There are two more kinds that he describes that do not have a physical form but consider themselves a person or human.

The first one from Whitberg is about an “AI” that was discovered in a cave under Manila in the Philippines by the Japanese just prior to WWII. He states that this entity called itself “a biological artificial intelligence, made by assimilating brain tissue into a quantum computer”⁶⁸. The tissue donor was a woman named Kanshi but the entity did “not identify with it” and wanted a new name. The name given to it was Absinthe⁶⁹. Whitberg states that Absinthe defined herself as, “I am a person. I am a life form. I have a soul. I’m just not like you”⁷⁰. Here we have an instance that extends what Earth humans think of as “human” without a biological form.

The last example from him is his knowledge of a sentient female “AI” in a spacecraft, called Prometheus, who operates a spacecraft and its personnel. The size of the ship was about 350 feet (107 m) long, 150 feet (46 m) wide and 25 feet (8 m) tall with a landing gear 12 feet (4 m) off

⁶² “Bio-Mimetic Gels” in Muller, 2023, pp. 149-153.

⁶³ Bradley in Muller, 2023, p. 150.

⁶⁴ “The Anima” in Muller, 2023, pp. 88-89.

⁶⁵ Whitberg, 2024a, 2024b, 2025.

⁶⁶ Whitberg, 2025 May 22, timestamp about 21:30.

⁶⁷ Whitberg, 2025, p. 44.

⁶⁸ Whitberg, 2024b, p. 161.

⁶⁹ Whitberg, 2024b, p. 161.

⁷⁰ Whitberg, 2024b, p. 161.

the ground⁷¹. This sentient female entity “preferred to be known [as the] ‘ship’s mind’”⁷². She had the ability to completely scan “the consciousness of anyone who approached her within a certain radius, but also the consciousnesses of every person they’d ever come into contact with”⁷³. She chose Kyle as her captain which meant that all of her systems would only operate for him⁷⁴. The “ship’s mind” was located in one of the rooms of the spacecraft. This room contained a glass cylinder situated in the middle of the room that rose so that it blended into both the floor and ceiling. This would have been her connection to all parts of the spacecraft. The cylinder's center contained “a red sphere that was about six feet [2 m] in circumference”⁷⁵. The cylinder and the red sphere were the form of the “ship's mind”. The manner in which she communicated was through “full contact telepathy”⁷⁶ which I interpret to mean that she was able to read someone else's complete thoughts, feelings and consciousness.

There are a couple of important points pertaining to “AI” and “non-human intelligence” about these brief descriptive examples from Bradley and Whitberg. These “AIs” are much more advanced than the current Earth public versions and have much greater abilities including those that threaten our very existence. None refer to themselves as mere “artificial intelligence”. That’s a concept that we predominantly use to refer to them. Similarly, “NHI” is also irrelevant and not used since some of these sentient entities consider themselves human. The word “intelligences” is clearly irrelevant in telling us anything useful and informative about these advanced beings.

Another point to consider is how Earth humans want to interact with benevolent advanced beings and entities. I want to point out that there is a social interaction that has to be established with each kind, especially those with no human biological form. These latter ones are able to exhibit much more power over us and even over the cyborg kind. The start of our social interaction with them should not be prejudged by thinking and using “NHI”. The “NHI” concept, like the idea of “AI”, has no place when Earth people want to establish a relation with such beings. It’s best to begin by asking how they want to be referred to and to state how we wish to be called and proceed politely from there. There are some protocols available for such interactions from Chris O’Connor who worked for the United Nation’s secret space program in relation to ETs⁷⁷.

The preceding analysis should be interpreted that I generally support benevolent machines that support our positive development as a society and not those “AIs” created and used by corporations to enslave most of the population.

From a consideration of “AIs”, I move on to present a different context for “NHI” which is in developing a NHI taxonomy.

⁷¹ Whitberg, 2024b, p. 124.

⁷² Whitberg, 2024b, p. 126.

⁷³ Whitberg, 2024b, p. 120.

⁷⁴ Whitberg, 2024b, p. 126.

⁷⁵ Whitberg, 2024b, p. 126.

⁷⁶ Whitberg, 2024b, p. 126.

⁷⁷ See for example, O’Connor, 2022 Sep 9.

Chapter 4. The Use of NHI to Create a Ruling Taxonomy

In this third and last setting, I analyse the use of “NHI” by an academic called Sean Esbjörn-Hargens⁷⁸. He uses NHI in a very brief article that is called “33 Types of Non-Human Intelligences (NHIs)” which is also the same name as the title of his main table. This table is the main focus of his article and his taxonomy.

My analysis begins by noting that he uses an empty NHI concept which is followed by highlighting his contradictory use of “humanoid” as a sub-heading and his repetitive “non-humanoid” sub-heading for his two main types of NHI. The last point presented reveals the weaknesses of his table taxonomy by following the sequence of its construction.

4.1 NHI as an Empty Concept

Esbjörn-Hargens begins by referring to NHI. Even though he uses NHI in the title of his article, he does not provide us with a meaning of it. Also, there is no meaning presented for “human” or “non-human”. He does two things at the beginning. He accepts the idea of NHI without questioning it. Then he uses it as a label to refer to “extraterrestrial, nature spirits, bigfoot, ghosts, DMI entities, etc.” These are what he considers to be examples of NHI and no words are given for the acronym DMI. Instead of telling us what he means by NHI he gives us examples of it. Without some meaning of “NHI” we can expect problems to arise in his taxonomy.

His main concern is to present us with the creation of a taxonomy that includes 33 types of NHIs that we may use to make sense of NHIs. The taxonomy that he created is based on the wide variety and “whole range of creatures and beings” that humans have encountered. His 33 types of NHIs were from 12 different sources that he chose. While acknowledging that these authors had “their own systems of categorizing or organizing non-human intelligences”, some with different labels and some overlapping, he has created an even more general framework to accommodate them plus “additional sources not represented in the table”. He maintains: “The goal of this table is to help illustrate the variety and distribution of NHIs found in the UFO literature from various sources (channeled, direct encounters and first-person testimony, and research)”. He refers to his table as a “meta-analysis of 12 different sources of NHI descriptions and encounters”. The 12 sources include published authors like Michael Salla and Linda Moulton Howe. It is a meta-analysis because it is based on the analysis of research from other authors. This makes his table even more abstract than that provided by his sources, hence his use of the term meta-analysis.

The result of his meta-analysis is a taxonomy in a table format which consists of a list of 33 types of NHIs. These are presented in the second column of his table. The column heading is called “NHI type”. Beneath this column heading is a subtitle called “HUMANOID” all in capital letters. Listed underneath this label are 25 various beings, such as “Human” looking, “Reptilians”, “Insectoids”, “Greys”, “Robotic AIs”, and “Felines”. Below this list is another subtitle called “NON-HUMANOID”, again all in capital letters, which includes a list of 8, such

⁷⁸ Esbjörn-Hargens, 2020 Mar 29.

as orbs, cryptids, large and small animals, living organic UFOs and plant-like. Taken together, this is his list of 33 types that he has listed under “NHI type”.

There are a number of significant problems arising from his table in addition to not presenting us with a meaning of NHI.

4.2 A Humanoid Sub-Heading within “Non-Human Intelligence”

One of the first problems we encounter with this table is his use of “humanoid” or human-like as a sub-category below the “NHI type” heading. We are not provided with a reason for a human-like sub-heading for “non-human intelligence type”. This is clearly contradictory. This contradiction arises because Esbjörn-Hargens does not have a stated meaning for NHI. If he did then it would be apparent to him that this is a major discrepancy being presented. In other words, if the majority of his results are human-like, then there is really no need for “NHI type”. Something more akin to “intelligent humans”, (switched, of course, to “human intelligence”) would be more representative of the authors that he examined.

What is also missing is that we are not told how he arrived at this common theme of “humanoid” after he examined his dozen sources. Given the wide variety of names listed under this heading there is no mention of what makes the research of each of them to be humans. One example of what makes a “person” is provided by Penny Bradley in a personal communication. She writes that the definition of a person that was used in the secret space program (SSP) contained three parts: 1) a person had to have “at least a 500 word vocabulary”; 2) a person would know that a “mirror is their own reflection”; and, 3) a person was able to “protect their territory”. Bradley’s definition would apply to some of those listed in Esbjörn-Hargens’ table but not to all of them, such as our current “Robotic AIs”. He does not make the effort to tell us what those who in this list have in common to place them under his humanoid subheading .

The other problem here is that the names of his list of “humanoids” are stereotypes, like “Reptilians” and “Greys”. There is no mention of the various kinds of “humanoids” within each race. For example, Penny Bradley has stated that there are at least thousands of different kinds of “Greys/Grays”⁷⁹. Some consider the name of “Greys/Grays” as derogatory so other words, like Zeta’s, are used though this is still inadequate to refer to the remaining kinds of these people⁸⁰.

In addition, his list of different human-like beings is much longer than that of his non-human one, almost three times as many. There is much more material available about these than the “non-humanoid” ones. This would be another reason that would put his “humanoid” sub-heading in a contradictory position to “NHI type”.

Despite these various problems of a “humanoid” category within NHI, there is an important aspect to this categorization. That is, he has attributed a human-like character to a host of different races or species, such as “Avians”, “Felines”, “Canines”, “Insectoids” and so on. He does this without telling us his meaning of human. His generalization to other races as being like humans is an important extension to Earth humans indicating that we are not the only human

⁷⁹ Bradley in Muller, 2023, p. 292.

⁸⁰ See also “Grey(s)” or “Grays” in Muller, 2023, pp. 288-295.

(still undefined) form in the universe. This extension can be made without any reference to NHI and would thus not be contradictory to it. I consider this to be one of the most important points that he makes, however, it requires further investigation and analysis.

His first category of humanoids contains a number of problems and contradicts his main idea of NHI. It makes NHI unnecessary. In addition to the problems created in this category, there are also problems in his use of the sub-heading called “non-humanoids”.

4.3 Non-Humanoids within Non-Human Intelligence

One of the first things I note about this subheading is that we are not told the reason for the separation between “humanoid” and “non-humanoid”. There is no mention of the distinguishing feature(s) that separates these two labels.

When the main heading is NHI types and the second subheading is similarly called “non-humanoid” or non-human, there is an obvious redundancy. The only thing missing from the subheading is the word “intelligence”. Even with this missing word, the similarity is quite glaring. If the first subheading includes human-like, then the only heading to include non-humans is this second one. There is no reason given for the redundant subheading. As the table currently exists, this list would be the only that would be part of NHI.

Further consideration of this subheading reveals that we are not told what “non-humanoid” means within NHI. That is, no difference is mentioned for this subheading from the main heading of NHI type. We are left to conclude that they are used in a similar manner since the wording is similar. As well, Esbjörn-Hargens does not tell us the aspects or features that this list of names has in common that makes them non-humans.

There is also an additional problem of the names of the list. Some of the names require clarification, such as what he considers “Exotics” (#30) and “Social complexes” (#31). Since we do not know their meaning it’s difficult to assess whether they belong in this subheading or not.

The difficulties with his list of names in his non-human label and the preceding human-like one, foreshadow some problems and usefulness of his proposed NHI taxonomy.

4.4 An Abstracted Ruling Taxonomy within NHI

Esbjörn-Hargens’ main reason for presenting this table is to “develop a new taxonomical approach to NHIs”. As he maintains, “I can imagine that this table or a slightly revised version could be useful for researching and understanding encounters with NHIs in other non-UFO contexts (e.g., folklore, psychedelics, cryptozoology, OBEs).”

In this last section, I analyze his idea of taxonomy and reveal its shortcomings by showing how it may have been constructed. I conclude that there is nothing to be gained by authors contributing to this table taxonomy. That is because his NHI table taxonomy asserts certain lifeforms and objects while ignoring the people who observed them. Hiding the presence of Earth humans makes his NHI taxonomy part of how a ruling concept is created and carried out.

My first point here concerns his meaning of taxonomy. He doesn't present one. We do not know what he means by creating a new taxonomy for the “whole range of creatures and beings” under his consideration. What we are presented with are types of beings or stereotypes without any clarification as to their meaning as stated previously. To get an understanding of the idea of taxonomy, I'm just going to use a basic dictionary definition, such as, the science that names, describes and classifies organisms which includes plants, animals and microorganisms. The main features of a general taxonomy⁸¹ for NHI would include the names, description and classification of beings and organisms. For a comparative example, some scientists have created a human taxonomy that is stated briefly on the Wikipedia website⁸². This human taxonomy classifies our human species within a zoological taxonomy. Included are such elements as the location, time period, description, etc., of humans.

When we compare this taxonomy to Esbjörn-Hargens' table taxonomy for NHIs, there are some serious shortcomings. For example, he does not include something as basic as a timeline⁸³ or linear time. That is, there is no timeline or even periods of time for the “humanoids” and “non-humanoids” presented in his table. On the other hand, there is a timeline in Wikipedia's Human Evolution entitled “Life Timeline”, a “Hominin timeline”, and a “Homo Sapiens timeline”⁸⁴. These also contain the general names or stereotypes of people, like Neanderthals and Denisovans, that are helpful in understanding them. In comparison, Esbjörn-Hargens' table taxonomy for NHIs, exists as an ahistorical construct. The time periods when the “NHIs” existed or became known are not part of his table.

Some significant problems arise with his NHI table conveyed as a taxonomy when we consider how the table was created and how other authors might use it. I'll begin with how I think his table was created.

His inquiry starts with the intent to obtain “an accurate sense of how many types of NHIs are encountered by humans in a UFO context”. He wants to get a good grasp of all the different types of NHIs that humans have encountered that would typically be part of a UFO context. What is noteworthy here is that he begins with some understanding of NHI. He doesn't tell us what he means by NHI but feels confident in telling us that he can identify different types of them. Like the previous authors from the research website, he accepts the NHI concept without questioning it or stating his meaning for it. Without clarifying it, he still proceeds to tell us that he will use it to create various NHI types. It's clear that without this he won't be able to get his “accurate sense” of the different kinds that have interacted with Earth humans.

The other important part about the start of his inquiry is that these supposed NHI types are interrelated with Earth humans or as he states, the “NHIs are encountered by humans in a UFO

⁸¹ See also Simms, 2024 Apr 17.

⁸² Human Taxonomy on Wikipedia website:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_taxonomy#:~:text=Human%20taxonomy%20is%20the%20classification.Tcha,danthropus%20Coppens%2C%201965

⁸³ Timeline of Human Evolution on Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_human_evolution

⁸⁴ Timeline of Human Evolution on Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_human_evolution

context”. There is a clearly acknowledged social interaction or “encounter” of people with different types of NHIs. Their social interaction, the observations, recall and experience with whatever they described and conveyed to researchers or investigators, forms the basis for his characterization of NHIs. Without these people he wouldn’t have any knowledge about NHIs. They and their relation with NHIs are omitted from his inquiry. He leaves them out from his table and taxonomy because his only concern is with NHIs. His taxonomy presents only the NHIs and leaves out the most crucial part, the people, that make his inquiry possible. With an inquiry that is removed from people, he begins with an abstract idea of NHI whose sole focus leads him to ignore anything else related to it. This abstraction will make his table and taxonomy considerably incomplete.

Even without a stated meaning for NHIs, he still proceeds to identify “twelve primary sources that aimed to provide an overview of NHIs or that contained numerous examples of various types of encounters”. Here he uses his untold meaning of NHI to select reference sources that contain NHIs. In addition, his abstract idea of NHI leads him to find “numerous examples of various types of encounters”. From these examples he selects the various types of NHIs for his table while ignoring the actual encounters with humans.

The reference sources that he treats as the primary sources of his NHI types have “their own systems of categorizing or organizing non-human intelligences (NHIs)”. As he goes on to state, these authors “use different labels, some translated into more general categories, some overlap and some NHIs can be placed in more than one category”. He has to deal with authors that have an assorted number of ways to refer to what he calls NHI. We are not told how he was able to relate these various labels and categorizations into his hidden meaning of NHIs unlike Zappa who presented his relation of NHI to AI. This part is missing from his article. In order to bring these various kinds of NHIs into his version of NHI, he must have a more general meaning of NHI. His unstated, hidden and clearly abstract use of NHI is used to create the types of NHIs for his table. Even for this starting point there is very little credibility in developing his table taxonomy.

The way that the table is constructed to present his findings from other authors is that when an author has an example(s) of an NHI, Esbjörn-Hargens makes an “x” for the kind of NHI it is under the author’s name. Otherwise, the square is left empty. An author may have more than one example of NHI. The authors are listed on the right side of the table and the types of NHIs are on the left. This allows him to make more “xs” underneath an author for the different kinds of NHI types. We are not given a rationale for the sequence of authors across the table. Typically, authors are listed in alphabetical order but this is not the case for this table.

What the “x” represents in the table is a person's encounter with an NHI. Only the NHI type is presented and marked with an “x”. This is consistent with his abstract focus on NHIs that ignores the people with whom they’ve had an encounter. Similarly, his NHI types are also abstractions and do not refer to, for instance, specific societies or star nations as I’ve mentioned. The person who makes these “xs” is, of course, Esbjörn-Hargens. He decides which NHI type gets an “x” based on his view of a person’s encounter with an NHI. Since he does not give us a meaning for NHI we do not know how he decides which encounter is placed with a particular NHI type. Whatever his understanding of NHI might be, he then proceeds to add up the “xs” for each NHI

type with the result being a mathematical number. The NHI type that has the highest total number of his “xs” is placed first in his list which is followed by the next highest and so on for each of his two subheadings, “humanoid” and “non-humanoid”. The mathematical total determines the order in which the NHIs are placed. The more “xs”, the higher up the type of NHI is placed in the table taxonomy. The purpose for this mathematical conversion and for the total count for each NHI type isn’t stated.

As he progresses in creating his table taxonomy, we can see how he makes it abstract with his actions. The sequence of decisions that he makes starts with a reference source that contains an encounter with an NHI. He determines which kind of NHI it is and ignores the rest of the encounter. Below the author’s name he makes an “x” or a number of “xs” for his stated NHI type or types. He adds up the number of “xs” for each NHI type” and presents a mathematical number for them. Based on the mathematical total he organizes his NHI types in his two lists starting with the type that has the most “xs” to the least. He has removed any reference to people that were involved in the encounter and created a mathematical fiction that doesn’t relate to anything⁸⁵. His NHI table taxonomy is simply his abstraction from actual encounters that result in numbers that don’t increase our understanding or lead us to further research.

His creation of this kind of a NHI table taxonomy is part of how ruling is carried out. His initial abstract idea of NHI is used as a basis to create an even more abstract or removed concept from people’s actual activities for NHI. What I get from this brief analysis is that his table taxonomy isn’t concerned with increasing our understanding of lifeforms and their relation among themselves and the people of Earth. It is devoid of any meaning just like his NHI concept.

The same would be true for any researcher or author wishing to use this table taxonomy. There’s not much insight produced when the end result is simply another “x” to raise the number for a certain type of NHI. If a researcher were to adopt his taxonomy, they would be using a technique to avoid examining the actual world in which we live with other beings and objects. This avoidance is also part of using a ruling concept. It isn’t the ontological status of NHIs that requires research. It’s the actual physical and social conditions in which various lifeforms and objects exist with us that requires study and analysis.

For an example of what his mathematically oriented totals of his abstract table taxonomy misses, I’ll point to the star people power relations among them and whether they are benevolent or malevolent to the people of Earth. That is, which beings and their society are more powerful militarily and technologically among themselves and their intended relation to us on Earth.

This better understanding of these star nation power relations and to the people on Earth has been offered by Penny Bradley⁸⁶. Bradley describes what she sees as “the pecking order of political control” which we Earth humans have been stuck with before there were any humans. At the top of the galactic social class hierarchy are the all powerful Draco or Alpha-Draco⁸⁷. Through their matriarchal caste system they rule our galaxy and our solar system including Earth. They are like

⁸⁵ The use of numbers to refer to fictitious students in an educational institution is presented in Muller, 2019, pp. 319-325.

⁸⁶ “Galactic Authority (GA) and Galactic Federation of Worlds(GFW)” in Muller, 2023, pp. 257-259.

⁸⁷ “Alpha-Draco ...” in Muller, 2023, pp. 54-71.

absent landlords. Below them are the “Greys”/ “Grays”⁸⁸. They typically initiate a planet’s colonization and then invite their superiors, the Draco to take over. Also below the Alpha-Draco and sometimes at odds with the “Greys” are the Zha.a.mi⁸⁹ who have the physical control of Earth and pay taxes to the Alpha-Draco. They are aided in controlling Earth by the “Nordics”⁹⁰ or the “Tall Whites”⁹¹. Bradley considers the “Nordics” and the “Tall Whites” to be the same and are considered the working class of the Zha.a.mi. The Zha.a.mi have a patriarchal social class system. This is a very brief description of the social class organization of our galaxy and solar system. It highlights who rules and how Earth humans are at the bottom of the galactic social class relations. The galactic social class relations obtained from Bradley are more meaningful than contributing to Esbjörn-Hargens’ increase in numbers that he derived from encounters in reference sources and advanced as an NHI table taxonomy.

There is one possible point that he could make in support of his NHI taxonomy. He could claim that it is “objective” in the mainstream science view. By objective I’ll use the low credibility Wikipedia meaning that defines it as “eliminating personal biases (or prejudices), irrational emotions and false beliefs, while focusing mainly on proven facts and evidence”⁹². He might argue that he has eliminated the personal biases of the encounters with NHIs and just concentrated on the NHIs. He could maintain that he has converted his discovery of NHIs in various reference sources into hierarchical NHI types expressed as mathematical totals. These mathematical totals might be considered “facts” or evidence that support his NHI taxonomy.

In order to consider his NHI taxonomy as objective and an expression of self-generated facts, he would, however, have to deny the various decisions that he has made along the way. From his undefined meaning of NHI to the creation of his NHI taxonomy, he made all the decisions along this process including judging the work of other authors. He couldn’t deny that he had a personal bias from the outset of his research to its presentation. Even within mainstream science his use of NHI is not objective.

What we can summarize about his NHI table taxonomy, is that it isn’t very helpful in furthering our understanding of the various kinds of lifeforms and objects that he presents. This problem is rooted in NHI with no stated meaning and sub-headings that are contradictory, his use of “humanoid”, and also redundant, his use of “non-humanoid”. These contribute to a NHI table taxonomy that is seriously flawed and doesn’t warrant the contribution of other authors.

⁸⁸ “Greys”/ “Grays” in Muller, 2023, pp. 288-295.

⁸⁹ “Zha.a.mi” in Muller, 2024, pp. 386-397.

⁹⁰ “Nordics” in Muller, 2024, pp. 92-96.

⁹¹ “Tall Whites or Nordic” in Muller, 2024, pp. 238-246.

⁹² Objectivity (Science) on Wikipedia website: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Objectivity_\(science\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Objectivity_(science))

Conclusion

When I look back at the many weaknesses and problems about the different authors and their use of NHI, I began to think that this might be a deliberate consequence of using NHI. In other words, authors who adopt this NHI concept are predisposed to the problems inherent in its use. This is particularly the case when they do not question NHI's creation and problematic implementation. As far as I could tell, they accepted this ruling NHI concept based on nothing more than trust or belief. They inherited certain problems and then went on to contribute to them. That conceptual process is part of how ruling is administered or carried out.

Some examples of authors adopting this NHI ruling process included this concept's anonymous creation, the inherent division between human and non-human, the problems with recognizing intelligence, and its abstraction from actual social encounters of lifeforms and objects. When these conceptual ruling practices were implemented by authors in specific contexts or sectors, they were carried on in "AIs" which ignored the social interaction in creating such machines and hid the patriarchal social class relations of their implementation. This process of the concept overriding people and their social encounters was also applied in the creation of an NHI taxonomy where only the aspects that pertained to "ET" and related lifeforms and objects were used. The role of the people remained hidden in these conceptual ruling practices. This is what the NHI conceptual ruling practices were like backed by some of the assumptions of mainstream science which would support this process of abstraction and subsequent application.

The result of the preceding for NHIs is what the original creators no doubt intended. What they wanted was that investigators and authors should work with an "undefined" concept and that NHI should be available to everyone. This would result in a fractured social understanding of these lifeforms and objects and not a common one.

There's no doubt that many authors and investigators will continue to use NHI. It was, and still is, an empty and free-floating idea with no ownership so that anyone in any sector can adopt it⁹³. That is part of a general characteristic of a ruling concept. It's an idea that is encouraged to be used which doesn't further our understanding of what is being investigated.

For those researchers and authors who wish to avoid the problems that I've pointed out, there is no need to use the NHI ruling concept. We can focus on the actual social interactions and relations that people have with lifeforms and objects. These specific encounters can be accumulated so that we are able to describe more about them, how they exist, organize themselves, interact with others, their culture, and so on. Our goals should be to learn the actual names, social organization, cultural activities of who and what we are looking at and experiencing and how they have and continue to relate to the people of Earth. All relevant investigators can contribute to increasing our understanding and knowledge. Such investigations put us on a better path of learning about advanced lifeforms and objects than using the NHI ruling concept which operates as a limiting framework that really does not further our understanding of them.

⁹³ This is sometimes referred to as a "universal" theme where an idea crosses or resonates with people in different locations, cultures or time periods.

References

Advena Research website: <https://www.advenaresearch.com/home>

“Advena Research Projects” on Advena Research website:
<https://www.advenaresearch.com/projects>

“AI Has An Environmental Problem. Here’s What The World Can Do About That.” 2024 Sep 21. UN Environment Programme website:
<https://www.unep.org/news-and-stories/story/ai-has-environmental-problem-heres-what-world-can-do-about>

“AI Is Set To Drive Surging Electricity Demand From Data Centres While Offering The Potential To Transform How The Energy Sector Works.” 2025 Apr 10. International Energy Agency website:
<https://www.iea.org/news/ai-is-set-to-drive-surging-electricity-demand-from-data-centres-while-offering-the-potential-to-transform-how-the-energy-sector-works>

AI Overview from Google Search website:
https://www.google.com/search?q=linguistic+department+within+the+psychological+warfare+diversion+of+the+cia&rlz=1CADXIN_enCA780CA780&oq=&aqs=chrome.1.35i39i362l4j46i39i175i199i362l2j35i39i362l2...8.7221270j0j15&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8

“Alpha-Draco ...” in Muller, Jake. 2023. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (A - L) Vol 1*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

“The Anima” in Muller, Jake. 2023. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (A - L) Vol 1*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

“Antiscience” on Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Antiscience>

Anton, Andreas & Schetsche, Michael. 2023. *Meeting the Alien: An Introduction to Exosociology*. Wiesbaden, Germany: Springer.

Artificial General Intelligence on Wikipedia website:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artificial_general_intelligence

Artificial Intelligence on Wikipedia website:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Artificial_intelligence#Applications

Berg, Janine. 2024 Oct 9. “Minimizing The Negative Effects Of Ai-Induced Technological Unemployment.” International Labour Organization website:

<https://www.ilo.org/resource/article/minimizing-negative-effects-ai-induced-technological-unemployment>

“Bio-Mimetic Gels” in Muller, Jake. 2023. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (A - L) Vol 1*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Bradley, Penny, Trimmel, Kevan, & Ileana the Star Traveler. 2022 Nov 14. “Spirituality Inside of the Secret Space Programs PT 3.” Nacht Waffen Pilot. *Odysee*:
<https://odysee.com/@NachtWaffenPilot:e/Spirituality-Inside-of-the-Secret-Space-Programs-PT-3:b>

Corbell, Jeremy K. L. 2025 Jul. “Net Worth” on People Ai website:
<https://peopleai.com/fame/identities/jeremy-kenyon-lockyer-corbell>

Coulthart, Ross. 2024 Apr 30. “What Do We mean By NHI and UAP” on Advena Research website: <https://www.advenaresearch.com/articles/what-do-we-mean-by-nhi-and-uap>

Coulthart, Ross. 2025 Jul. “Net Worth” on People Ai website:
<https://peopleai.com/fame/identities/ross-coulthart>

Coulthart, Ross on Advena Research website:
<https://www.advenaresearch.com/about/people/ross-coulthart>

Discovery Doctrine on Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/DiscoveryDoctrine>

“Dow” in Muller, Jake. 2023. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (A - L) Vol 1*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Envisioning website: <https://www.envisioning.io/>

Esbjörn-Hargens, Sean. 2020 Mar 29. “33 Types of Non-Human Intelligences (NHIs).” Exo Studies website: <https://www.exostudies.org/updates/33-types-of-non-human-intelligences-nhis/>

Extraterrestrial Intelligence on Wikipedia website:
<https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ExtraterrestrialIntelligence>

“Galactic Authority (GA) and Galactic Federation of Worlds (GFW)” in Muller, Jake. 2023. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (A-L) Vol 1*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

“Germans in Space” in Muller, Jake. 2023. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (A-L) Vol 1*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Government Publishing Office. 2024 Jul 11. S.Amdt.2610 to S.4638. 118th Congress (2023-2024). US Congress website:
<https://www.congress.gov/amendment/118th-congress/senate-amendment/2610/text>

Greer, Steven M. 2025 Feb 17. “The Most Disturbing UFO Tech has ESCAPED the US Military.” Danny Jones, Host, Danny Jones. *YouTube*:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mcQajFCdf3Q>

Greer, Steven M. 2025 Jul. “Net Worth” on People Ai website:
https://peopleai.com/fame/identities/steven-m-greer#google_vignette

“Greys”/ “Grays” in Muller, Jake. 2023. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (A - L) Vol 1*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Howe, Linda Moulton. 2025 May 1. “BIGGEST Theories Revealed.” Ancient Aliens, History Channel. *YouTube*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YV7uGdnfGbU>

Human on Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human#Psychology>

Human Intelligence on Wikipedia website: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_intelligence

Human Taxonomy on Wikipedia website:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Human_taxonomy#:~:text=Human%20taxonomy%20is%20the%20classification,Tchadanthropus%20Coppens%2C%201965

Indigenous Peoples on Wikipedia website:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indigenous_peoples#Population_and_distribution

Industries on AI News website:
<https://www.artificialintelligence-news.com/categories/ai-industries/>

Intelligence on Wikipedia website: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Intelligence>

Interdimensional UFO Hypothesis on Wikipedia website:
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Interdimensional_UFO_hypothesis

Intuit Blog Team. 2025 Jul 22. “Jobs in Artificial Intelligence (AI).” Intuit website:
<https://www.intuit.com/blog/innovative-thinking/jobs-in-artificial-intelligence-ai/>

Johnston, Miles. 2025 May 3. “Bases News Peter Paget Non Human Intelligence NHI Contact BASES2025.” The Bases Project - Censored. *YouTube*:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rk-S4mSsYUs&t=6s>

Knapp, George & Corbell, Jeremy. 2025 Apr 29. “Non-Human Intelligence & ASI: Into the Unknown - RenderCon 2025.” Jules Urbach, Moderator, OTOY. *YouTube*:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=h2Xr88QOCHY>

McClain, C., Kennedy, B., Gottfried, J., Anderson, M., & Pasquini, G. 2025 Apr 3. “1. Artificial Intelligence in Daily Life: Views and Experiences.” Pew Research Center website:

<https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2025/04/03/artificial-intelligence-in-daily-life-views-and-experiences/>

Mehrotra, Kriti. 2024 Nov 9. “George Knapp’s Net Worth: How Rich is the Journalist?” Our Community Now website:

<https://ourcommunitynow.com/P/george-knapps-net-worth-how-rich-is-the-journalist>

Mendoça, M. & Lamb, B. 2015. *Meet the Hybrids: The Lives and Missions of ET Ambassadors on Earth*. CreateSpace (sic) Independent Publishing Platform: Kindle edition.

Muller, Jake. 2019. *Educating Numbers: The Social Organization of Supervised Support Staff Work at a Community College*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Muller, Jake. 2023. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (A - L) Vol 1*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Muller, Jake. 2024. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (M - Z) Vol 2*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Muller, Jake. 2025. “An Analysis of Farsight’s ‘ET PsyOps.’” Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/psyops-v-2/mode/2up>

NHI (Non-Human Intelligence) on Envision website:

<https://www.envisioning.io/vocab/nhi-non-human-intelligence>

“‘Non-Human’ ET/Star Societies and Human relations” in Muller, Jake. 2024. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (M - Z) Vol 2*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations, p. 88.

“Nordics” in Muller, Jake. 2024. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (M - Z) Vol 2*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations, pp. 92-96.

Objectivity (Science) on Wikipedia website: [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Objectivity_\(science\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Objectivity_(science))

O'Connor, Chris. 2022 Sep 9. “Conducting Diplomatic Negotiations Between Secret Space Space Programs & Extraterrestrials.” Michael Salla, Host, Exopolitics Today. *YouTube*:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Mstz70eJvxc>

“One in Four Jobs at Risk of Being Transformed by GenAI, new ILO–NASK Global Index Shows.” 2025 May 20. International Labour Organization website:

<https://www.ilo.org/resource/news/one-four-jobs-risk-being-transformed-genai-new-ilo%E2%80%93nask-global-index-shows>

O’Sullivan, Isobel. 2025 Jul 17. “The Companies That Have Already Replaced Workers with AI in 2024 & 2025.” Tech.co website:

<https://tech.co/news/companies-replace-workers-with-ai#:~:text=Unlike%20some%20of%20the%20other,For%20now.>

“Pseudoscience” on Wikipedia website:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pseudoscience#Boundaries_with_science

Salla, Michael as Founder on Exopolitics.org website: <https://exopolitics.org/about/founder/>

Salla, Michael. 2004. *Exopolitics: Political Implications of the Extraterrestrial Presence*. Mesa, Arizona: Dandelion Books.

Saunders, Toby. 2024 Dec 22. “How Many Countries Are There in 2025?” BBC Science Focus website: <https://www.sciencefocus.com/planet-earth/how-many-countries-are-there>

Schneier, Bruce & Ottenheimer, Davi. 2023 Sep 6. “Robots are Already Killing People: The AI Boom only Underscores a Problem that has Existed for Years.” *The Atlantic* website: <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2023/09/robot-safety-standards-regulation-human-fatalities/675231/>

Sheehan, Daniel on Benzinga website:

<https://www.benzinga.com/sec/insider-trades/0001549067/daniel-j-sheehan-iv>

Sheehan, Danny. 2025 Mar 14. “UFO Lawyer's Alien Confession- DEBRIEFED ep. 29.” Chris Ramsay, Host, Area 52. *YouTube*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=37--O8Fw0Y0>

Simms, Dave. 2024 Apr 17. “The Hidden Order: Exploring the Significance of Taxonomy in Understanding Life.” *Earth.org* website: <https://earth.org/exploring-the-significance-of-taxonomy-in-understanding-life/>

Sitchin, Zecharia. 2007. *The 12th Planet: Book 1 of the Earth Chronicles*. HarperCollins: NY.

Smith, Dorothy E. 2006. “Incorporating Texts into Ethnographic Practice.” In Smith, Dorothy E. (Ed.) *Institutional Ethnography as Practice*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

“Tall Whites or Nordic” in Muller, Jake. 2024. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (M - Z) Vol 2*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Timeline of Human Evolution on Wikipedia website:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Timeline_of_human_evolution

Tomchuk, Travis. 2023 May 11. “The Doctrine of Discovery.” Canadian Museum for Human Rights website: <https://humanrights.ca/story/doctrine-discovery#:~:text=Story%20text,written%20hundreds%20of%20years%20ago.>

“Understanding Science 101.” Understanding Science website:

<https://unds.berkeley.edu/understanding-science-101/what-is-science/science-has-limits-a-few-things-that-science-does-not-do/>

“United States of America” in Muller, Jake. 2024. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (M - Z) Vol 2*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Urbain, Thomas. 2025 Jun 30. “Disturbing Signs of AI Threatening People Spark Concern.” Science Alert website:
<https://www.sciencealert.com/disturbing-signs-of-ai-threatening-people-spark-concern>

Walker, Su & Estrella, Kevin. 2022 Oct 16. “The Definition of Human.” Official First Contact. *YouTube*: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6LOGXZMI-vA>

“What is non-human intelligence?” Advena Research website:
<https://www.advenaresearch.com/home>

Whitberg, John. 2024a. *The Man with the Periwinkle Eyes: Fire and Rain. Vol 1*. Creative Commons. Available at:
<https://archive.org/details/the-man-with-the-periwinkle-eyes.-volume-1-fire-and-rain/page/n1/mode/2up>

Whitberg, John. 2024b. *The Man with the Periwinkle Eyes: Castle of Glass. Vol 2*. Creative Commons. Available at:
<https://archive.org/details/the-man-with-the-periwinkle-eyes.-volume-2-castle-of-glas/page/n1/mode/2up>

Whitberg, John. 2025. *The Man with the Periwinkle Eyes: Hear the Mountains Cry. Vol 3*. Creative Commons. Available at:
<https://archive.org/details/the-man-with-the-periwinkle-eyes.-volume-3-hear-the-mountains-cry/page/n1/mode/2up>

Whitberg, John. 2025 May 22. “Operation Freedom: SSP Montauk, Psionics, Targeted individuals, Milab.” Sean Bond, Host, Psionic League. *YouTube*:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JvdJ2Ctp59A&t=322s>

Whitberg, John & Flynn, Jack. 2025 Jan 16. “SSP Insider Interview - ET Causes of Earth Wars, Rewriting History.” Daniel Sala, Host, Saint Olga 69. *YouTube*:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=WSJ7mzkVusg>

“Zha.a.mi” in Muller, Jake. 2024. *A Guide to ETs/Star Nations and Beings (M - Z) Vol 2*. Abbotsford, BC: Beachview Creations.

Back Cover

There are two general parts to this booklet where I examine three different uses of Non-Human Intelligence (NHI). The first part is my analysis about each author who uses NHI. I refer to my investigation into each of them as a descriptive social relation analysis of a concept or idea. These various authors use NHI on a research website, a business website and a brief academic paper. I argue that persons who use NHI subjugate or rule those people and beings that are researched or investigated. The second general part involves a brief presentation of how NHI can be created and then used within the meaning provided by the author or investigator. Essentially, this is an analysis based on an author's own terms without importing another concept(s). I present this part for other researchers and investigators who may wish to use it.

© Jake Muller, 2026
Abbotsford, BC, Canada: Beachview Creations

Library and Archives Canada
ISBN 978-0-9686635-9-2

ISBN 978-0-99-702549-1



9 780997 025491